BEFORE THE 1 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON 2 IN THE MATTER OF 3 DALE R. MONTY, d.b.a. ARLINGTON SHAKE COMPANY, 4 PCHB No. 692 Appellant, 5 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, v. 6 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION 7 CONTROL AGENCY, 8 Respondent. 9

THIS MATTER being an appeal of a \$250 civil penalty for an alleged open burning violation of respondent's Regulation I; having come on regularly for hearing before the Pollution Control Hearings Board on the 8th day of April, 1975, at Everett, Washington; and appellant, Dale R. Monty, d.b.a. Arlington Shake Company, appearing pro se and respondent, Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency, appearing through its attorney, Keith D. McGoffin; and Board members present at the hearing being Chris Smith, presiding officer, and Walt Woodward and the Board having considered the sworn testimony, exhibits, records and files herein and

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1 | having entered on the 24th day of April, 1975, its proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, and the Board having served said propos 2 Findings, Conclusions and Order upon all parties here... by certified 3 mail, return receipt requested and twenty days having elapsed from said 4 service; and 5 The Board having received no exceptions to said proposed Findings, 6 Conclusions and Order; and the Board being fully advised in the premises; 7 now therefore, 8 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that said proposed 9 Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, dated the 24th day of 10 April, 1975, and incorporated by this reference herein and attached 11 hereto as Exhibit A, are adopted and hereby entered as the Board's 12 Final Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order herein. 13 DONE at Lacey, Washington, this 22 day of 14 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 15 16 17 18 19 20 $2 \pm$ 22

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

23

24

CERTIFICATION OF MAILING

I, LaPene Barlin, certify that I deposited in the United States mail, copies of the foregoing document on the <u>J3P</u> day of <u>Nay</u> 1975, to each of the following-named parties, at the last known post office addresses, with the proper postage affixed to the respective envelopes:

Mr. Dale R. Monty P. O. Box 42 Arlington, Washington 98223

Mr. Keith D. McGoffin
Burkey, Marsico, Rovai, McGoffin,
 Turner and Mason
P. O. Box 5217
Tacoma, Washington 98405

LARENE BARLIN

POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD

3 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT.
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
27 | AND OPDER

1 i

2i

BEFORE THE 1 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON 2 IN THE MATTER OF 3 DALE R. MONTY, d.b.a. ARLINGTON SHAKE COMPANY, 4 Appellant, PCHB No. 692 5 6 v. FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION AND ORDER 7 CONTROL AGENCY, 8 Respondent. 9

This matter, the appeal of a \$250 civil penalty for an alleged open burning violation of respondent's Regulation I, came before the Pollution Control Hearings Board (Chris Smith, presiding officer, and Walt Woodward) as a formal hearing in the Snohomish County Courthouse, Everett, on April 8, 1975.

Appellant appeared pro se; respondent through Keith D. McGoffin. Jennifer Roland, Olympia court reporter, recorded the proceedings.

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were admitted.

From testimony heard and exhibits examined, the Pollution Control

EXHIBIT A

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Hearings Board makes these

ô

FINDINGS OF FACT

I.

Respondent, pursuant to Section 5, chapter 69, Laws of 1974, 3rd Ex. Sess., has filed with this Board a certified copy of its Regulation I containing respondent's regulations and amendments thereto.

II.

Section 9.02(d)(3)(i) of respondent's Regulation I makes it unlawful to cause or allow an outdoor wood waste fire without obtaining a permit from respondent for such fire. Section 9.02(g) states that it shall be prima facie evidence that the person who controls property on which an outdoor fire occurs has caused or allowed said fire. Section 3.29 authorizes a civil penalty of not more than \$250 for any violation of Regulation I.

III.

On November 28, 1973, while appellant was operating his Arlington Shake Company on rented property near Arlington, Snohomish County, appellant was notified by an inspector on respondent's staff that appellant's wood waste open burning permit issued by respondent had expired and that it would be necessary for appellant to obtain another such permit prior to burning wood waste.

IV.

On July 24, 1974, on the same property described in Finding of Fact III, several piles of wood waste and sawdust smoldered and burned over an area of about one-half acre. Nobody was present near the fires or in a dwelling on the property which had been occupied by appellant. An

^{27 |} FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

lautomobile, leased by appellant, was parked on the property. least two cows, owned by appellant, grazed on the property.

V.

The smoldering fires were observed by an inspector on respondent's He ascertained that appellant had no wood waste burning permit from respondent. From an address obtained from the firm which leased the automobile to appellant, respondent mailed to appellant Notice of Violation No. 9351, citing Section 9.02 of respondent's Regulation I, and Notice of Civil Penalty No. 1684, in the sum of \$250, and Notice of Civil Penalty No. 1684 (amended), also in the sum of \$250, which is the subject of this appeal.

VI.

Appellant began renting the property described in Finding of Fact III in January, 1971, and thereupon conducted his shake business, in the course of which he dumped on the ground the piles of wood waste and sawdust which were burning on July 24, 1974. On May 1, 1974, appellant sold his shake manufacturing equipment and ceased operations as Arlington Shake Company. He and his family continued to reside in the dwelling on the property. On June 15, 1974, appellant made his final monthly advance rental payment. He and his family left the Evelling for residence in Eastern Washington on or about July 20, 1974, but he left family possessions in the dwelling, parked his leased automobile on the property and grazed his cows on the property. On July 27, 1974, appellant returned from Eastern Washington to the Arlington property to nowe the family possessions to Eastern Washington. 26 ion this visit, he noticed the charred piles of wood waste and sawdust

3

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

 24

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND CROER

but does not know how the fires were ignited.

VII.

Any Conclusion of Law hereinafter recited which is deemed to be a Finding of Fact is adopted herewith as same.

From these Findings, the Pollution Control Hearings Board comes to these

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I.

There is no proof that appellant ignited the fires in question.

They burned, however, in piles of wood waste which he had accumulated in his shake mill operation. Further, appellant had no permit from respondent to burn wood waste.

II.

The question before this Board is whether appellant still was in "control" of the property as cited in Section 9.02(g) of respondent's Regulation I. He had paid his final month's rent on June 15, 1974, but he still resided in the dwelling on the property for five days after the expiration of that rental period and retained his family possessions, his leased car and his cows on the property for at least 12 days after said expiration, including the date cited in Notice of Violation No. 9351. This Board, therefore, must find that appellant was in control of the property in question on July 24, 1974.

III.

It follows, therefore, that appellant was in violation of Section 9.02, as cited in Notice of Violation No. 9351.

FINDINGS OF FACT,

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

ث۔

1	IV.
2	Having determined that there is no proof that appellant ignited
3	the fires, this Board finds the maximum allowable amount in Notice of
4	Civil Penalty No. 1684 (amended) to be unreasonable and excessive.
5	v.
6	Any Finding of Fact recited herein which is deemed to be a
7	Conclusion of Law is adopted herewith as same.
8	Therefore, the Pollution Control Hearings Board issues this
9	ORDER
10	The appeal is denied but the \$250 penalty is stricken and
11	appellant is directed to pay respondent the sum of \$50.
12	DONE at Lacey, Washington this 34th day of 1975
13	POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
14	Clay Swith
15	CHRIS SMITH, Chairman
16	Walt Woodward
17	WALT WOODWARD, Member
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
_n '	•

Ę

(

FINDINGS OF FACT, 27 , CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER 5